

THE DAMNATION OF SCOTT HAHN

Whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not

Randall Paquette

© 2006

Interspersed throughout this article you will encounter quotes from two of the more notorious Roman Catholic Marians: Alphonsus de Luigori, and Louis de Montfort. Both have the Vatican's seal of *nihil obstat*, and *imprimatur*, upon their literary works. Therefore, these contain nothing offensive or contrary to Catholic doctrine, and present the excesses that Mariolatry indulges. Following their quotes, I might offer a comment, but usually I allow them to blasphemously speak for themselves.

Behold the handmaid of the Lord

Rome - As our advocate, placed between God and the sinner, she [Mary] takes it upon herself to invoke the clemency of the judge so as to temper his justice, to touch the heart of the sinner and to overcome his obstinacy.

*Address of Pope Pius XII on
St. Louis Marie de Montfort*

The Bible - *And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.*

1 John 2:1

Rome - In all circumstances they will have recourse to her as their advocate and mediatrix...

Louis de Montfort

The Bible - *For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.*

1 Timothy 2:5

There can be no act more worthy of punishment than to have “trodden under foot, the Son of God.”¹ There can be no deceit more deserving of God's damning ‘anathema’ than to reject the true and pure gospel in order to promulgate the labyrinthine and distorted ramblings of ‘another gospel’². And when false prophets and false teachers, ‘bring in’ and prop up, ‘damnable heresies’, then they have earned “the swift destruction”³ that awaits them. The pale cold intellect of Scott Hahn continues to flicker in the dark, arid world of Catholicism. True to the magisterium of Rome, Hahn insists that the Light of the World conceal Himself beneath the robes of Rome's ever-virgin queen, and thereby replace the gospel of Christ, with the ‘gospel of Mary’!

¹ Hebrews 10:29

² Galatians 1:8&9

³ 2 Peter 2:1-3

She [Mary] is the sanctuary and resting place of the Blessed Trinity where God dwells in greater and more divine splendor than anywhere else in the universe, not excluding his dwelling above the cherubim and seraphim.⁴

...Mary is a key gateway into salvation history. The bible portrays Mary as the all-holy one who gave the word flesh, the Mother of God, and the spiritual mother of all who live by faith in her son.⁵

When we pray to the Mother of God we are heard more quickly than when we call directly on the name of Jesus...⁶

Be it unto me, according to Thy word...

We are all under obligation to God for whatever we have, because everything is but a gift from Him; but by taking flesh from Mary and becoming Man, God was pleased to put Himself under obligation to her.⁷

...the height of her merits rising up to throne of the Godhead cannot be measured; the greatness of the power which she wields over one who is God cannot be conceived; and the depths of her profound humility and all her virtues and graces cannot be sounded. What incomprehensible height! What indescribable breadth! What an impenetrable abyss! ...The whole world is filled with her glory...⁸

Now, Scripture cannot be disputed, as when it authoritatively states that God *worketh all things after the counsel of His own will*. When God created *the heavens and the earth*, no man was His counselor, advising Him how he should fashion a star, or the circumference to assign to the earth, or the method by which to nourish the minutest cell, or the form that man should take. And when man fell in the depredation of unreasonable rebellion, none could stay God's hand when He chose to curse all that He had created upon this orb, even those lesser creatures not directly culpable in that first sin, but now, by His will, *subject to vanity*.⁹ God, according to a wisdom exceedingly greater than man's, and a will, constrained by no agency or influence outside of Himself, chose that *in the fullness of time*, - a span that He, Himself measured out as He saw fit,- chose *in the fullness of time*, to send His Son into the world, to redeem Adam's fallen race. And it remained God's prerogative to save none, as much as to save some; for God was not compelled to save any. The imperative rested in the sovereign will of God alone. In the light of that sovereignty we must ask, did God chose Mary, or did Mary have to be chosen? Was the choice according to the will of God, or according to the essence of Mary?

Recognizing that it was of God, according to His will and purpose alone, we must put our hands to our mouths, lest we say too much. For neither was it that God was blessed to have Mary to

⁴ True Devotion To The Blessed Virgin, St. Louis de Montfort; Monfort Publications, 1993, p.2

⁵ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

⁶ The Glories of Mary, Alphonsus de Luigori; Chapter 4 – To Thee Do We Cry, Poor Banished Children Of Eve, (It might be argued that he is quoting a “St. Anselm” but that is a moot point.)

⁷ Ibid.; Chapter 6 – ‘Turn Then Most Gracious Advocate’

⁸ True Devotion To The Blessed Virgin, St. Louis de Montfort; Montfort Publication, 1993, p2&3

⁹ Romans 8:21

choose, but that Mary received the blessing of being chosen of God, for *without all contradiction, the less is blessed of the better.*¹⁰ She was *blessed among women*, and not above all of mankind, or all nations, or all creation, because she was chosen amongst all other obedient virgins, in the lineage of David, according to God’s will and not her merit, to be an instrument through which God would bring His Son and her Savior, into the world. The blessedness of the one chosen is solely because of the “Chooser,” *for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?*¹¹ And, what of the Incarnation? When the Holy Ghost came upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadowed her, are we to imagine, that supernatural spermatozoon impregnated an egg, already naturally abiding in her womb, an egg existing independent of God’s will, solely of her body’s creating? Could not He, with Whom *all things are possible*, and Who *calleth those things which be not as though they were*¹², create, in a *non-ovulated*, virgin womb, the Son of Man? In other words, God needed nothing physiologically from her, for in the womb that He had created, and that He had chosen to use, He could create and place that fertilized egg. In order to become ‘very man of very man,’ Christ no more needed a human mother than did the first man in Eden. God, Who created the first Adam, could likewise create that last Adam. In a body that God Himself *wonderfully and fearfully made*, without human intervention¹³, He brought forth His firstborn, “without father, without mother.”¹⁴ What did Mary have by nature in her flesh and specifically, in her womb that was not God’s by right as Creator that any should dare say that He took aught of her, and consequently was indebted to her? All of this is to state that Mary was but a simple girl, simply used of God. It is not, as Rome would have us believe, that in Mary God discovered a perfection that at first rivaled, and then overawed Deity Itself.

“Hail then, O hope of my soul!” exclaims St. Ephrem (of Mary); “Hail, O sure salvation of Christians; hail, helper of sinners; hail, fortress of the faithful and salvation of the world!”¹⁵

The most Blessed Virgin Mary is Queen of more than heaven and all the saints. She is Queen also over hell and all evil spirits, for she has gloriously routed them with her virtues.¹⁶

She is omnipotent...¹⁷

Heresies, and Damnable Heresies

If the sun failed to rise, what would the world be, but a chaos of horrible darkness? Take away the sun and where is the day? Take away Mary, and what is left but the darkest

¹⁰ Hebrews 7:7

¹¹ Matthew 23:19

¹² Romans 4:1

¹³ Hebrews 10:25

¹⁴ Hebrews 7:3

¹⁵ The Glories of Mary, Alphonsus de Liguori; Chapter 3 – ‘And Our Hope’

¹⁶ Ibid.; Chapter 4 – ‘To Thee Do We Cry, Poor Banished Children Of Eve’

¹⁷ Ibid.; Chapter 6 – ‘Turn, Then, Most Gracious Advocate’

night? If Mary ignores and condemns someone, that person is inevitably lost. Therefore, woe to those who turn their back on the Sun!¹⁸

...devotion to our Blessed Lady is necessary to attain salvation.¹⁹

As she is herself the earthly paradise, that virgin and blessed land from which sinful Adam and Eve were expelled, *she lets only whom she chooses enter her domain in order to make them saints.*²⁰

He who finds Mary finds life...²¹

As a papal functionary, Scott Hahn is required to shore up the unscriptural Catholic doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and Assumption of Mary:

We also explore the biblical basis for key Catholic doctrines and dogmas regarding Mary - her Immaculate Conception, perpetual virginity and Assumption into heaven.²²

For the first dogma begets the last:

Further, two postulates (one with 13 and a second with 7 signatures) refer likewise to the Immaculate Conception as a theological reason for the Assumption. Just as the Blessed Virgin in entering life was preserved from every corruption of sin, so in leaving this world she was preserved from every corruption of the body, because of reverence for her virginal flesh: "Sicut a Deo custodita fuit a corruptione peccati in ipso suo primo introitu ad vitam, sic et in felici suo exitu, *ob reverentiam virgineae carnis*, ex qua carnem sumpsit, a corruptione corporis servatam immunem." Bishop Monescillo in his postulate states simply: "Dogma fidei est Immaculata Conceptio B. M. V.; dogma fidei oportet esse eiusdem B. M. V. Assumptio." These statements indicate that the Immaculate Conception is to be considered as the proximate motive, the immediate reason, for the Assumption.²³

And so, Hahn begins with an inescapable observation and a justifiable question:

The Mother of Jesus is mentioned only about a dozen times in the New Testament. So why is Mary so important to Catholic faith and devotion?²⁴

"Only about a dozen times in the New Testament," and this "*about a dozen times*" is to be discovered in fewer than ten chapters out of 260 chapters, and 7,959 verses; limited further to only the first five books, disappearing entirely after the first chapter of Acts, which is typical of Mary's position in Scripture, notable by her absence. And none of the occasions where she does appear establish any doctrine concerning Mary, save her initial virginity, and her lineage. And

¹⁸ The Glories of Mary, Alphonsus de Liguori; Chapter 2 – 'Our Life, Our Sweetness'

¹⁹ True Devotion To The Blessed Virgin, Louis de Montfort; Monfort Publications, p. 16

²⁰ Ibid.; p.18 (italics mine – ed)

²¹ Ibid.; p.21

²² Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

²³ The Vatican Council on the Assumption of Our Lady; Dom Jerome Gassner, www.catholicculture.org

²⁴ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

these facts are essential to Mary, because of Christ. Hahn speciously writes, “Paul mentions her but not by name”, implying the thoughts of the apostle were upon his ‘Lady’.²⁵ But Paul is no Marian, and the text is dealing with Christ’s humanity, and not His earthly mother. Yet for all this sparseness, Rome’s addresses her Mary in superlatives that equal and excel those of Christ.

For since Angels and human beings, all things in Heaven and earth, are under God’s dominion, so they are at the same time under Mary’s dominion. ...”O Mary...you have dominion and power over all creation.”²⁶

Finally, we must say in the words of the apostle Paul, “Eye has not seen, nor has ear heard, nor has the heart of man understood” the beauty, the grandeur, the excellence of Mary, who is indeed a miracle of miracles of grace, nature and glory. ...If then, as is certain, the knowledge and the kingdom of Jesus Christ must come into the world, *it can only be* as a necessary consequence of the knowledge and reign of Mary.²⁷

Consequently, none of this dearth of New Testament witness discourages Hahn, because he is defending the glory of his queen:

“In our first lesson we acknowledged the relative scarcity of direct references to Mary in the New Testament.”²⁸

“Relative scarcity”? Plenary paucity; and more, a total absence of any scriptural statements that mirror those offices and attributes of Christ, which Rome extravagantly and erroneously claims are Mary’s. Nonetheless, Hahn remains undaunted because he knows that Rome’s perfidiousness can turn silence into a redoubtable ally:

God the Father willed that she should perform no miracle during her life, at least no public one, although he had given her the power to do so. God the Son willed that she should speak very little although he had imparted his wisdom to her. Even though Mary was his faithful spouse, God the Holy Spirit willed that his apostles and evangelists should say very little about her and then only as much as was necessary to make Jesus known.²⁹

The best proof then must be no proof. Silence shouts the loudest, and the evident traditions of Rome are more authoritative than the absence of teachings in Scripture. And so the ‘all-holy’, ‘omnipotent’, ‘Savior and Queen of the world’ stood in the wings, anticipating the moment when Rome would reveal her splendor and glory to a world that Christ alone, could not, or would not, save. And the Vatican’s scribes wrested out her glory by the corrupting and abuse of Scripture. Where Rome’s pagan fathers, superstitious doctors and simple saints have trod, there of necessity, Hahn must go. He begins to lead adherents down the twisted passages of Catholic doctrine. At Matthew 1:16, he commences his false teaching:

²⁵ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn; ref. Galatians 4:4

²⁶ The Glories of Mary, Alphonsus de Luigori, Chapter 1 – ‘Hail, Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy’

²⁷ True Devotion To The Blessed Virgin, St. Louis de Montfort; Montfort Publications, p.4 (italics mine – ed)

²⁸ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

²⁹ True Devotion To The Blessed Virgin, St. Louis de Montfort; Montfort Publications, p.1

She is introduced as “Mary. Of her was born Jesus who is called the Messiah.” We have to read these words in context. These are the final words of a list of descendents Matthew has drawn up to demonstrate that Jesus is the “Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.”³⁰

Then Hahn presents a brief overview of the Messianic expectation from Abraham until David, and through the prophets, concluding thus:

Read in context then, the few words that Matthew gives us about Mary are no trifling matter. In this short sentence Matthew has effectively positioned Mary at the center of Israel’s history...³¹

In a chapter that begins with these words, *The book of the generation of Jesus Christ the son of David, the son of Abraham*³², Hahn would have us believe that Matthew’s intention is to position Mary “at the center of Israel’s history”? The purpose of sixteen verses, demonstrating Jesus’ lineage through Joseph, for that is whose ancestry is recorded, achieves a seminal moment, by placing Mary in the middle of momentous events? The ulterior and ultimate motive of a section that began with *the generation of Jesus Christ*, and concluded with, *Jesus, who is called the Christ*, is actually focused on Mary, so that even without scriptural support, in the hands of wily and inventive theologians, she might achieve a dignity, and glory equal to the Lord’s? To satisfy Rome, she not only is to be “positioned at the center,” she is the center!

Those souls will fall and be lost, who do not have recourse to Mary.³³

How is that the same God who was so rigorous in punishment under the Old Law now shows such mercy to persons guilty of far greater crimes? He does it because of his love for Mary, and account of her merits.³⁴

For God has made her queen of heaven and earth, leader of his armies, keeper of his treasures, dispenser of his graces, worker of his wonders, restorer of the human race, mediatrix on behalf of men, destroyer of his enemies, and faithful associate in his great works and triumphs.³⁵

Jesus said, *Search the scriptures, for in them ye think that ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me*. But Hahn will have none of it. They must be made to testify of Rome’s Mary first and foremost, even if Hahn has to read between the lines, the syllables, the consonants and the vowels in order to accomplish it. It cannot be denied that an abundance of scripture attests to the glory of Jesus Christ the Son of God, but greater indeed must be Mary, for a trifling, essentially non-existent amount has made her not merely His peer, but His superior.

³⁰ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

³¹ Ibid

³² Matthew 1:1

³³ The Glories of Mary, Alphonsus de Luigori; Chapter 2 – ‘Our Life, Our Sweetness’

³⁴ Ibid.; Chapter 9 – ‘O Clement, O Loving’

³⁵ True Devotion To The Blessed Virgin, Louis de Montfort; Montfort Publications, p.11

...it is certain that our Lord remains in heaven just as much the Son of Mary as he was on earth. Consequently he has retained the submissiveness and obedience of the most perfect of all children towards the best of all mothers.³⁶

Every prayer of hers is like an established law for our Lord, obliging Him to be merciful to everyone for whom she intercedes. "...God the Son, taking delight in glorifying you [Mary], grants your every petition as if He were paying a debt."³⁷

We would be in a very bad way indeed, sinners as we are, if we did not have this great Advocate, who is so powerful and merciful, so prudent and wise, that the Judge, her Son, cannot condemn the guilty when she defends them. Then all hail, O Court for settling every case! ...Jesus Christ...can obtain for us and wants to obtain, pardon and grace as He has promised. But in Christ human beings cannot help recognizing and fearing the Divine Majesty, which belongs to Him as God. So it was necessary to appoint another Advocate, to whom we can have recourse with less fear and *with greater confidence*. And this second Advocate is Mary.³⁸

Christ's inability to "obtain, pardon and grace" for sinners is due to His Deity, but where God the Son fails, Mary the mortal can and does, succeed. Thank heavens Scripture teaches nothing about this, because that way (applying Rome's maxim – i.e., the best proof is no proof) we can have confidence, indeed "greater confidence" in Rome's Mary. And best of all, Rome has declared her to be Immaculate, as witnessed by sources greater than the Bible:

Pope Pius IX declared the dogma on December 8, 1854, in a document entitled *Ineffabilis Deus* ("The Ineffable God"). He noted the long history of the Church's belief that Mary was unstained by original sin - expressed especially in the writings of popes and in the Church's prayers and worship. And he noted that this belief was ultimately founded on centuries of preaching and teaching on three passages that we have looked at in great detail in earlier lessons - the "first Gospel" in the Garden of Eden (see Genesis 3:15), the annunciation (see Luke 1:26-38), and the vision of the "woman" in the Bible's last book (see Revelation 12).³⁹

The pope, according to Hahn noted also that this belief rested "on centuries of *preaching and teaching on three passages*"; to be interpreted as the 'subjective and biased' teaching of Rome. Why is this doctrine so essential?

There is an incongruity in the supposition that the flesh, from which the flesh of the Son of God was to be formed, should ever have belonged to one who was the slave of that arch-enemy, whose power He came on earth to destroy. Hence the axiom of Pseudo-Anselmus (Eadmer) developed by Duns Scotus, *Decuit, potuit, ergo fecit*, it was becoming that the Mother of the Redeemer should have been free from the power of sin

³⁶ Ibid.; p. 10

³⁷ The Glories of Mary, Alphonsus de Luigori; Chapter 1 – 'Hail, Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy'

³⁸ Ibid.; Chapter 6 – 'Turn, Then, Most Gracious Advocate' (italics mine)

³⁹ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

and from the first moment of her existence; God could give her this privilege, therefore He gave it to her. Again it is remarked that a peculiar privilege was granted to the prophet Jeremiah and to St. John the Baptist. They were sanctified in their mother's womb, because by their preaching they had a special share in the work of preparing the way for Christ. Consequently some much higher prerogative is due to Mary. (A treatise of P. Marchant, claiming for St. Joseph also the privilege of St. John, was placed on the Index in 1833.) Scotus says that "the perfect Mediator must, in some one case, have done the work of mediation most perfectly, which would not be unless there was some one person at least, in whose regard the wrath of God was anticipated and not merely appeased."⁴⁰

But if it was 'incongruent' for Mary "from which the flesh of the Son of God was to be formed, should ever have belonged to one who was the slave of that arch-enemy, whose power He came on earth to destroy", then it was equally incongruent that she who was given "*such power to defeat and overthrow and crush this proud rebel*"⁴¹, should not have parents immaculately conceived. If it be argued that this was not necessary, because God could preserve her inviolate within her mother's womb, likewise could He, and did He, preserve Christ in the non-immaculate Mary. In an article which Hahn links to at his website, with the terse summary, "a good overview", can be found this limp defense of these popish doctrines:

Nonbelievers and enemies of Roman Catholic Christianity often accuse the Church of creating the belief in Mary's freedom from original sin "the Immaculate Conception" in 1854 (as the Church named the belief of Mary's immediate entry, body and soul, into Heaven, "the Assumption" in 1950) when the truths were defined. Such an error is equivalent to saying that before Adam named the animals and birds of creation in Gen 2:19-20 they did not exist. Or that before the early Church in her Ecumenical Councils named the belief of three persons in one God "the Trinity" and the belief that there are two natures, human and divine in the person of Jesus Christ "the Incarnation," the truths did not exist.⁴²

Whatever point they were attempting to make, they failed miserably. There is no equivalency between Rome's 'created' doctrines of the 'Immaculate Conception' and the 'Assumption', and the two Biblical 'truths' referred to. That the animals existed before Adam assigned them names is a truth attested to by the first chapter of Genesis⁴³. That Jesus Christ is both the Son of Man, and the Son of God, is found on the pages of the Bible⁴⁴. The trinity also unfolds before us in Scripture⁴⁵. But the Assumption of Mary, and the Immaculate Conception? "No direct or categorical and stringent proof of the dogma can be brought forward from Scripture,"⁴⁶ is the admission of Rome concerning the 'Immaculate Conception', and nicely sums up the Assumption also, for:

⁴⁰ The Catholic Encyclopedia

⁴¹ de Montfort, see footnote 71

⁴² The Immaculate Conception of Mary, Paul Flanagan and Robert Schihl

⁴³ Genesis 1:24 -*And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind...*

⁴⁴ John 1:1,14 -*The Word was God...and the Word became flesh...*

⁴⁵ Matthew 28:19 -*baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*

⁴⁶ The Catholic Encyclopedia; Classic 1914 Edition; on cd

The belief in the corporeal assumption of Mary is founded on the apocryphal [which means, ‘of doubtful authenticity’ –ed] treatise *De Obitu S. Dominae*, bearing the name of St. John, which belongs however to the fourth or fifth century. It is also found in the book *De Transitu Virginis*, falsely ascribed to St. Melito of Sardis, and in a spurious letter attributed to St. Denis the Areopagite. If we consult genuine writings in the East, it is mentioned in the sermons of St. Andrew of Crete, St. John Damascene, St. Modestus of Jerusalem and others. In the West, St. Gregory of Tours (*De gloria mart.*, I, iv) mentions it first. The sermons of St. Jerome and St. Augustine for this feast, however, are spurious. St. John of Damascus (P. G., I, 96) thus formulates the tradition of the Church of Jerusalem:

St. Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, at the Council of Chalcedon (451), made known to the Emperor Marcian and Pulcheria, who wished to possess the body of the Mother of God, that Mary died in the presence of all the Apostles, but that her tomb, when opened, upon the request of St. Thomas, was found empty; wherefrom the Apostles concluded that the body was taken up to heaven.⁴⁷

Poor old Thomas, doubtless once again he is on the wrong side of faith. And as I wrote earlier, the best proof is no proof, to which may be added, ‘better late than never.’

Devotion to Our Blessed Lady in its ultimate analysis must be regarded as a practical application of the doctrine of the Communion of Saint. Seeing that this doctrine is not contained, at least explicitly in the earlier forms of the Apostles' Creed, there is perhaps no ground for surprise if we do not meet with any clear traces of the cultus of the Blessed Virgin in the first Christian centuries.⁴⁸

In other words, there was no veneration of Mary in the first two centuries of Christianity. Perhaps there is no reason to be surprised at this, but there is cause for alarm that it is practiced today. But why should Rome be concerned that Mariolatry is not “in the earlier forms of the Apostles' Creed”; they are not disturbed that it is nowhere in the Bible! To further justify the foundation of Rome’s dubious doctrines, she turns to another unreliable source:

Similarly, certain interpolated passages found in the Sibylline Oracles, passages which probably date from the third century, show an equal preoccupation with the dominant role played by the Blessed Virgin in the work of redemption (see especially II, 311-12, and VIII, 357-479). The first of these passages apparently assigns to the intercession "of the Holy Virgin" the obtaining of the boon of seven days of eternity that men may find time for repentance (cf. the Fourth Book of Esdras, vii, 28-33).⁴⁹

Rome is the victim of her own propaganda; what she has taught, she believes, and because she believes it, it must be so. But if an ultimate authority is required:

⁴⁷ Ibid,

⁴⁸ Ibid,

⁴⁹ The Catholic Encyclopedia

The 'Blessed Virgin Mary' appeared to St. Bernadette in Lourdes France only four years later in 1858. When St. Bernadette asked her name, Blessed Mary replied, "I AM THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION." This confirmed the dogma.⁵⁰

Who needs the Bible? Certainly not the Church of Rome:

As in the arguments for the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, the scriptural texts alone, without their interpretation by tradition, would not furnish the complete meaning of the dogma with all required certitude, so likewise for the dogma of the Assumption. Once the distinct and certain knowledge of the fact by tradition is conceded, it can be demonstrated that this truth is implicitly contained in Scripture (cfr. L. Lercher, S.J., "Institutiones Dogmaticae," Innsbruck, 1925, Vol. III, p. 338).⁵¹

Removing the superfluous and sophistical verbiage, Rome admits that "once... tradition is conceded, it can be demonstrated that this... is... *implicitly* contained in Scripture." So 'tradition' is the touchstone for religious truth, to which Scripture must defer. Therefore, in the absence of any scriptural witness to these extraordinary religious doctrines we are told:

"Today, the belief in the corporeal assumption of Mary is universal in the East and in the West; according to Benedict XIV (De Festis B.V.M., I, viii, 18) it is a probable opinion, which to deny were impious and blasphemous."⁵²

Benedict XIV could not accuse Hahn of impiety or blasphemy:

In the same way, the Church's doctrines about Mary - about her Immaculate Conception, her status as the "ever-Virgin Mother of God," and her "Assumption" into heaven as "Queen of all things" - represent a definitive interpretation of the whole of Scripture as it relates to Mary's role in God's plan for our salvation.⁵³

Hahn is less than half correct. True, they are the "Church's doctrines about Mary", not the Bible's; but more precisely they are: the "novel opinions and ideologies" of Rome. But "definitive"!!??? How can this be when "no direct or categorical and stringent proof of the dogma can be brought forward from Scripture", and the only evident source is the half-baked ramblings of heretical and dubious scribes, and fatuous pagan oracles?

The Traditions of Men

*Beware lest any man spoil you through
philosophy and vain deceit,*

⁵⁰ The Immaculate Conception, A Stumbling Block for Protestants, But Not For Catholics; Bob Stanley
www.home.inreach.com

⁵¹ The Vatican Council on the Assumption of Our Lady; www.catholicculture.org

⁵² The Catholic Encyclopedia, Classic 1914 Edition

⁵³ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

*after the traditions of men*⁵⁴

With the traditions of his Church as his authority and his eyes fastened upon his mediatrix, Hahn writes:

This sin [original sin] is inherited by every human being as Eve became the “mother of all the living”.⁵⁵

As is his wont, Hahn shows himself to be a sad and sorry scribe. The New Testament does not mention Eve, as the progenitor through whom we inherit “original sin”, nor is Mary referred to as the “New Eve”, but rather:

*Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, **who is a figure of Him that was to come.***

Romans 5:14

*For as in Adam all die, even so **in Christ all shall be made alive.** And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; **the last Adam** was made a quickening spirit.*

1Corinthians 15:22&45

It is through Adam, the head of the human race that our sin nature is derived, and the curse conferred, but who cares what Scriptures says, it is what it doesn’t say that is important. Besides, Rome has taken care of the annoyance caused by these texts:

But remember that only molten and liquefied substances may be poured into a mould. That means that you must crush and melt down the old Adam in you if you wish to acquire the likeness of the new Adam in Mary.⁵⁶

That the Bible never speaks of a “new Adam” is inconsequential. Nor does the fact that Christ as the last Adam precludes any “new Adam”, interfere with the establishing of novel Catholic doctrine. And, that the New Testament never mentions a ‘New Eve’ is less trifling than the references to Mary herself:

[The] Catholic belief in the Immaculate Conception flows from the New Testament portrait of Mary as the “New Eve.”⁵⁷

What portrait? It does not exist, save in the lurid and distorted imaginations of Rome’s teachers. Emboldened Hahn tells another lie:

⁵⁴ Colossians 2:8

⁵⁵ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

⁵⁶ True Devotion To The Blessed Virgin, Louis de Montfort; Montfort Publications, p. 115 (Whence comes this ‘new Adam,’ since Christ is the Last Adam?)

⁵⁷ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

Paul wrote that sin entered the world through Adam and Eve and, as a result, "all sinned" and "condemnation came upon all" (see Romans 5:12,18).⁵⁸

Hahn was so insistent at the beginning of his study about reading "in context" but is adamant no longer. Paul does not even so much as hint at Eve in the referenced text.

And what of those three passages which centuries of papal preaching have honed into incontestable proofs? Faithful to Rome's dishonest hermeneutics, Hahn regurgitates the Catholic interpretation of Revelation 12:1&5:

Revelation shows us the Queen Mother enthroned in heaven, enthroned with her Son, in perfect fulfillment of the promise of the Davidic kingdom.⁵⁹

Cunningly, he disregards the fact that the woman in this chapter *cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered*⁶⁰, because after all he knows:

Even before the terms "original sin" and "immaculate conception" had been defined, early passages imply the doctrines. Many works mention that Mary gave birth to Jesus without pain. But pain in childbearing is part of the penalty of original sin (Gen. 3:16). Thus, Mary could not have been under that penalty. By God's grace, she was immaculate in anticipation of her Son's redemptive death on the cross. The Church therefore describes Mary as "the most excellent fruit of redemption" (CCC 508).⁶¹

Rest assured that Rome's habit of not relying upon the Bible remains intact, and the "passages" referred are not scripture texts. Mary, according to Rome, did not experience labor pains, so verse two must be nixed. But, Hahn compensates for this necessary abridgement by an inevitable embellishment upon the Davidic promise to include a queen. So you see, it all balances out, and in favor of Mariolatry too! The Bible that Hahn uses for reference contains this footnote:

[1] The woman adorned with the sun, the moon, and the stars (images taken from Genesis 37:9-10) symbolizes God's people in the Old and the New Testament. The Israel of old gave birth to the Messiah (Rev 12:5) and then became the new Israel, the church, which suffers persecution by the dragon (Rev 12:6, 13-17); cf Isaiah 50:1; 66:7; Jeremiah 50:12. This corresponds to a widespread myth throughout the ancient world that a goddess pregnant with a savior was pursued by a horrible monster; by miraculous intervention, she bore a son who then killed the monster.⁶²

The Catholic Encyclopedia also informs us that Hahn's interpretation of Revelation 12, faces other obstacles, besides hermeneutics:

⁵⁸ Ibid,

⁵⁹ Ibid,

⁶⁰ Revelation 12:2

⁶¹ www.catholic.com/library/Mary_Full_of_Grace.asp

⁶² New American Bible; United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

Cardinal Newman considers two difficulties against the foregoing interpretation of the vision of the woman and child: first, it is said to be poorly supported by the Fathers...⁶³

As expected, this ‘silence’ provides further proof for the doctrine, because Newman explains this ‘difficulty’ away:

Christians have never gone to Scripture for proof of their doctrines, till there was actual need, from the pressure of controversy; if in those times the Blessed Virgin's dignity was unchallenged on all hands, as a matter of doctrine, Scripture, as far as its argumentative matter was concerned, was likely to remain a sealed book to them.

Of course “*Christians have never gone to Scripture for proof of their doctrines,*” they relied upon pagan oracles, spurious scribes, heretical traditions or plain intuition. And even though every doctrine about Jesus was contested vigorously, *no faction ever found reason to challenge* ‘the Blessed Virgin’s dignity’. Right! We are further confronted with the astounding profundity of Hahn as he elaborates on the wedding feast⁶⁴:

Notice who is not mentioned in John's account. The couple being married. Isn't it odd that a wedding feast would be described but not the bride and groom?⁶⁵

What did I tell you, the man is deep! He did not notice “who is not mentioned” by Paul in Romans 5:12,18, but he is ‘on top of his game’ here. No, it is not “odd”, because this story is not an excerpt from a bridal magazine. And what does he mean, the wedding feast is “described”? Of course, his reasoning for that little ‘teaser’ question is obvious, Mary is the bride and this whole wedding is symbolic:

In the first covenant, we witness the marriage union of a man and a woman, Adam and Eve (see Genesis 2:23-24). And in the new covenant, we have a new man and a new woman present at a wedding feast. True, Mary is Jesus' mother, not His bride. But in order to understand the supernatural depths of biblical symbolism that John intends here, we need to set aside our "natural" ways of reading. As the "woman," Mary becomes the locus of a host of biblical symbols and expectations - she is simultaneously: a daughter of Israel, the mother of the new people of God, and bride of God.⁶⁶

Clever...or what? The shepherds at Christ’s birth are not named, perhaps they were symbolic of Mary being a shepherdess? The centurion at the Cross is nameless also, maybe Mary is the New Centurion of Heaven? I hope the Presbyterians recognize their boon in Hahn’s departure. No matter how he tries to avoid the obvious by his ‘unnatural’ reading, Mary, in his symbolic scenario, becomes the bride of Jesus, the “new Adam”. For Hahn, that which Eve lost, Mary shall redeem. Hahn introduced his teaching on Genesis 3 with the following cautionary statement, implying a personal innate mastery of ‘the temptation narrative’.

⁶³ The Catholic Encyclopedia; The Classic 1914 edition

⁶⁴ John 2:1-11

⁶⁵ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

⁶⁶ Ibid,

You can go back and listen to this tape that I think we made two or two-and-a-half days ago about how often we distort what really happened in the temptation narrative, because we don't know how to read Hebrew narrative.⁶⁷

Fortunately for us, Hahn knows how to 'read Hebrew narrative':

Let's turn to Genesis, chapter 3. There we see the first Eve having been seduced and, *I believe*, brutally intimidated into a kind of disobedient submission. . . . *But I believe*, just to sum it up, that Adam was called to be a faithful covenant head in a marital covenant, and he was called to show forth, as the representative of the covenant, the love, the hessed (sic), the loyalty of the covenant to the fullest degree. And, as our Lord says, "Greater love hath no man than to lay down his life for his beloved." . . . So she is being confronted and brutally intimidated by a dragon who is intent upon producing disobedience, come hell or high water. So in the cross-examination, in the interrogation that goes back and forth, Satan uses the truth in a clever, deceptive, but intimidating way to kind of force this woman to see, in effect, that if she doesn't eat that fruit, she will die, at least in the biological, physical sense because Satan will see to it. . . . where the heck is Adam in all this? By the end of the narrative you discover that he's right by the woman because she just turns and gives him the fruit to eat; but the question is, where was he all along? This loving covenant head, this loving covenant partner who is to show the great love that he's willing to lay down his life for his beloved? Well, he was probably rationalizing his silence by saying, "Well, if I oppose such a serpentine monster as this, I stand no chance." . . . *So it seems* as though Adam's response, or lack of response, is due to his fear of suffering and death. . . . So the first Eve, then, is abandoned by her covenant partner and husband *who was presumably* to tell that dragon where to go, and then, in a sense, stand up for his convictions and possibly even suffer martyrdom and to lay down his life for his beloved and trust that God, his Creator, to whom he is loyal in love would raise him and vindicate him in proper covenant judgment. *Which is exactly* what the second Adam does on behalf of the second Eve, the Church,⁶⁸

Based upon Hahn's percipient discernment, we are to believe that the devil 'brutally intimidated' them both by explicitly or implicitly, threatening to kill them? We are then to understand that death, which only came upon man as a consequence of the transgression (Romans 5:12), was held as a viable threat over him if he did not concede to transgress? According to Hahn's colorful yarn, Adam had to have been deceived or seduced and brutally intimidated along with Eve. But Paul teaches otherwise:

*And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.*⁶⁹

Given the fact that neither Paul, nor Moses, inspired by God, picked up upon this brutalizing by Satan, we are most fortunate to have the erudite Scott Hahn. Adam was not deceived by the serpent, but was persuaded by his wife; for thus is the testimony of God - *And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife*. The phrase 'with her,' does not

⁶⁷ Scott Hahn on Our Lady; www.catholic-pages.com

⁶⁸ Scott Hahn on our Lady, www.catholic-pages.com (isn't "disobedient submission" an oxymoron? -ed)

⁶⁹ 1 Timothy 2:14

necessarily, nor apparently mean that Adam stood dumbfounded beside her during the whole discourse. Some understand this expression to mean ‘their conjugal oneness’. Regardless, according to the word of God, Adam was not ‘brutally intimidated’ by Satan. And what of the crucial text in Genesis 3:15, Rome’s teachers believe:

Adam, the father of mankind, *looked to Mary crushing the serpent's head*, and he dried the tears that the malediction had brought into his eyes. Noe thought of her when shut up in the ark of safety, and Abraham when prevented from the slaying of his son; Jacob at the sight of the ladder on which angels ascended and descended; Moses amazed at the sight of the bush which burned but was not consumed; David escorting the arc of God with dancing and psalmody; Elias as he looked at the little cloud that rose out of the sea. In fine, after Christ, we find in Mary the end of the law and the fulfillment of the figures and oracles.⁷⁰

[T]hat we should understand that first and well-known prophecy and curse of God uttered against the serpent in the garden of paradise. It is opportune to explain it here for the glory of the Blessed Virgin, the salvation of her children and the confusion of the devil. “I will place enmities between you and the woman, between your race and her race; *she will crush your head* and you will lie in wait for her heel”. [God] gave her such hatred for the accursed enemy, such ingenuity in exposing the wickedness of the ancient serpent and *such power to defeat and overthrow and crush this proud rebel, that Satan fears her not only more than angels and men but in a certain sense more than God himself.*⁷¹

Apparently, this prophecy is not “well-known” to Hahn:

After Adam and Eve ate the fruit (see Genesis 3), God promised that throughout human history there would be an "enmity" between the serpent and the woman and between the offspring of the woman and the offspring of the serpent. He promised further there would be a decisive struggle and that the woman's male child would crush the serpent's head (see Genesis 3:15).⁷²

Whom should we believe; a pope, or his pupil? Certainly Rome would never teach that both views are equally valid, insisting that Mary crushed Satan through Jesus, for that would imply that *she* sacrificed Him for us?

Even at his death she had to be present so that he *might be united with her in one sacrifice and be immolated with her consent to the eternal Father*, just as formerly Isaac was offered in sacrifice by Abraham when he accepted the will of God. *It was Mary who nursed him, fed him cared for him reared him, and sacrificed him for us.*⁷³

⁷⁰ Encyclical of Pius X on the Immaculate Conception; Feb. 2, 1904

⁷¹ True Devotion To The Blessed Virgin, Louis de Montfort; Monfort Publications, p.22-23

⁷² Hail, Holy Queen; The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

⁷³ True Devotion To The Blessed Virgin, Louis de Montfort; Monfort Publications, p.7

And that would be pure heresy.⁷⁴ In a transcript from Hahn's "Hail, Holy Mother", he states:

Now some other translations render, "She will crush your head." And so we have statues of our Lady crushing the head of the serpent. That's an interesting but kind of tangential issue for us right now.⁷⁵

The Catholic Encyclopedia implies that it is less than "interesting," but worse than "tangential":

The translation "she" of the Vulgate is interpretative; it originated after the fourth century, and cannot be defended critically.

Hahn founders in the turbulence of Catholic doctrine. The Catholic Bishops do not see Mary in the symbolism of Revelation 12:1. Verse 2 disqualifies her anyhow. The Pope does not agree with whom Hahn designates as the serpent's crusher in Genesis 3. The Catholic encyclopedia shows him little support. He has proved himself to be a less than mediocre instructor and a faulty expositor, *handling the word of God deceitfully*. Can we trust him to do justice to the Annunciation?

So it goes on talking about in verse 5, the birth of John the Baptist foretold. We have here the annunciation to Zechariah. And then we have, after the birth of John the Baptist is recorded, the birth of Jesus foretold in the annunciation in verse 26, "In the sixth month, the Angel Gabriel was sent from God to a city of Galilee named Nazareth to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph of the house of David, and the virgin's name was Mary. And he came to her and said, 'Hail, full of grace.'" Now that Greek term is translated in various ways. Oh highly favored one, but the grace of God in the New Testament develops and it becomes a kind of substance and not just an attitude; that when God gives favor, it isn't just a feeling. It isn't just a thought. It isn't just a subjective posture or attitude. It's God's own life. So that when God favors you, he didn't just stand back and say, "Eeh, I like ya." He gives himself to you. So when she is full of God's favor, she is full of God's life and that's the term grace as it develops in the New Testament. So, "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with you," an absolutely unique address. Never before has an angel addressed somebody almost naming them full of grace. It doesn't say, "Hail, Mary, full of grace." It says, "Hail, full of grace," and it says it almost like a title.⁷⁶

The Greek word used is *kexaritomena*, which mean "highly favored, make accepted, make graceful"; "grace" from God being understood as His unmerited favor. The Greek expression translated "full of grace" is *plaras karitos*. It is used of Jesus (John 1:14). It is in the Catholic Latin translations, and their progeny, that Mary is said to be *ave gratia plena* – 'hail, full of

⁷⁴ So the Douay Rheims marginal note reads: *he shall crush. Ipsa*, the woman; so divers of the fathers read this place, conformably to the Latin; **others read it *ipsum*, viz., the seed**. The sense is the same: for it is by her seed, *Jesus Christ*, that the woman crushes the serpent's head.

⁷⁵ www.catholic-pages.com

⁷⁶ Scott Hahn on Our Lady; www.catholic-pages.com

grace'. As H.D. Spence expressed it, this "is an inaccurate rendering. Rather *gratia cumulata*, as it has been well rendered. 'Having been much graced (by God)' is the literal translation of the Greek word." The New Testament was written in Greek and not Latin, hence I would remind Hahn that the "text of the Bible has authority over the Christian church at all times," and "the text retains its role of privileged guide not open to manipulation."

The disputed word is a perfect passive participle. The passive voice makes God the Agent bestowing the action. Thus Mary is the object of grace rather than any bestower of grace. This is also confirmed by the phrase, "The Lord is with thee." She is blessed because God has chosen to bestow grace upon her. The only other place where this word is found in the New Testament is Ephesians 1:6 where it is translated "hast made us accepted" and also refers to an act of God upon the elect not due to any merits found in them but that which is found in Christ. Besides the Biblical use of "grace" carries the idea of God bestowing something that is not deserved and finds no cause for that blessing by God in that person. The fact that Mary claims God to be her "Savior" (Lk. 1:47) is her admission of lack of merit and full of sin. You would never find Jesus using those words "MY Savior" as he was without sin.⁷⁷

And for all Hahn's terpsichorean display, without a clear corroborating text to confirm that Mary was born sinless, it remains but a product of "the novel opinions and ideologies" of Rome. And so Rome confirms:

But the term *kecharitomene* (full of grace) serves only as an illustration, not as a proof of the dogma.⁷⁸

None of these three key verses, taken together, or separately, supports Rome's contentions concerning Mary. The magisterium called the tune, and Hahn unsuccessfully endeavored to make Scripture dance. But, Pius XII warned us about theologians like Hahn.

26. Often there are theologians and preachers who, following in the footsteps of the holy Fathers,[20] have been rather free in their use of events and expressions taken from Sacred Scripture to explain their belief in the Assumption.⁷⁹

"Rather free"? They have run amok!

I will...fight against them with the sword of my mouth

It is evident once again, that Hahn and Rome were never in earnest when they subscribed to this policy:

It is not a matter of *projecting novel opinions or ideologies* upon biblical writings but of sincerely seeking to discover what the text has to say at the present time. The text of the Bible has authority over the Christian church at all times, and, although centuries have

⁷⁷ Pastor Mark Fenison; Victory Baptist Church

⁷⁸ The Catholic Encyclopedia; Classic 1914 Edition, on cd

⁷⁹ *Munificentissimus Deus*; Pius XII

passed since the time of its composition, the text retains its role of privileged guide not open to manipulation. ...[t]he magisterium of the church 'is not above the word of God.'⁸⁰

For “project novel opinions and ideologies”, they have done:

Like the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption is not an event recorded in Scripture. Indeed, the last mention of Mary in the biblical narrative is in relation to the life of the early Church in the days between the Ascension and Pentecost (see Acts 1:14). But in *Munificentissimus Deus* ("The Most-Bountiful God"), Pius pointed to a long heritage of belief in the Assumption - an ancient tradition expressed in homilies, prayers, the dedication of churches, and the celebration of liturgies. Underlying this tradition was a rich vein of Scriptural meditation and interpretation.⁸¹

In the Catholic Encyclopedia is this interesting comment:

The existence of the obscure sect of the Collyridians, whom St. Epiphanius (d. 403) denounces for their sacrificial offering of cakes to Mary, may fairly be held to prove that even before the Council of Ephesus there was a popular veneration for the Virgin Mother which threatened to run extravagant lengths.⁸²

Thankfully the Vatican has been able to reign in that “threat” by merely elevating her as sovereign over God.

God the Father, from Whom every perfect gift and all grace come, as from its essential source, has given all graces to Mary by giving her His Son, so that, as St. Bernard says, "With His Son and in Him, God has given His Will to Mary."⁸³

At the command of Mary all obey, even God.⁸⁴

Behold, I will cast her into a bed

...the Church makes Mary say in the words of divine Wisdom, “*Those who work with my help – for their salvation – shall not sin.*”⁸⁵

According to St. Bonaventure, all the angels in heaven unceasingly call out to her: “Holy, holy, holy Mary, Virgin Mother of God”. They greet her countless times each day with the angelic greeting, “Hail Mary”, while prostrating themselves before her, begging her as a favor to honor them with one of her requests.⁸⁶

⁸⁰ The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church by The Pontifical Commission; IV, A., 1; (author’s italics) I quote this in my previous articles on Hahn

⁸¹ Hail, Holy Queen: The Mother of God in the Word of God, Scott Hahn

⁸² The Catholic Encyclopedia; on cd

⁸³ The Secret of Mary; Louis de Montfort; www.catholictradition.org

⁸⁴ The Glories of Mary, Alphonsus de Luigori; Chapter 6 – Turn, Then, Most Gracious Advocate

⁸⁵ True Devotion To The Blessed Virgin, Louis de Montfort; Montfort Publications, p.88

⁸⁶ Ibid.; p.3

No person can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him (Jn. 6:44). In similar words, says Richard of St. Lawrence, Jesus speaks of His Mother: "No one comes to Me unless My Mother draws that person by her prayers." ⁸⁷

Contrary to Catholic teaching, Christ does not temper justice⁸⁸, He satisfied it. He is the 'daysman' whom Job longed for: *Neither is there any daysman betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both.*⁸⁹ Jesus said, "Come unto me"⁹⁰ ...and...*him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out*⁹¹." But Catholicism seeks to block that free and blessed access to the one merciful Mediator and Advocate with the merciful Father, by her unscriptural dogmas concerning Mary. As Rome lauds the magnificence of her Mary, we hear echoing in concert in the distance, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" And God condemns this blasphemy, for thus saith the Lord:

I WILL NOT GIVE MY GLORY UNTO ANOTHER. ...I AM HE; I AM THE FIRST, I ALSO AM THE LAST. ⁹²

And what of Hahn who is trusting in his 'All-Holy Virgin Mother, Queen Mary'? *And I will kill her children with death!*⁹³

*But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.*⁹⁴

Randall Paquette may be contacted at: paghome@yahoo.com

⁸⁷ The Glories of Mary, Alphonsus de Liguori: Chapter 5 – To Thee Do We Send Up Our Sighs

⁸⁸ see quote from address of Pope Pius XII at beginning of this article

⁸⁹ Job 9:33 – a "daysman" is a mediator, and in this case one who could lay one hand upon man, and the other upon God. The Son of Man, who is also the Son of God, can and does do that.

⁹⁰ Matthew 11:28

⁹¹ John 6:37

⁹² Isaiah 48:11&12

⁹³ Revelation 2:23

⁹⁴ 2 Corinthians 4:3&4